

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the amendments above and the following comments.

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misread the specification, and that the enablement is, therefore, clear.

With respect to the paragraph at the top of page 3 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the first press station is, indeed, discussed at page 8, lines 7-20. The Examiner says that this is impossible since “[n]one of these configurations can be construed as being a press station.” However, the Examiner nowhere explains why this is so. Applicants point out that each of configurations (1)-(4) at page 8, lines 10-18, comprises two rolls. The Examiner concedes in the middle of the first paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action that the two roll combination mentioned in the specification at page 7, lines 25-27, constitutes a press station. It is unclear why the two roll combinations mentioned at page 8, lines 10-18, cannot also be considered to be press stations. Applicants respectfully submit that when the combinations at page 8, lines 10-18, are considered to be press stations, then the Examiner’s alleged inconsistencies in the first paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action disappear.

With respect to the paragraph bridging pages 3-4 of the Office Action, Applicants point out that consistent with the foregoing, the first press station is discussed at page 8, lines 7-20. After, passing through the first press station, the paper is passed to a second press station, which is also a compacting station. This is discussed in the paragraph bridging pages 8-9. The Examiner should note that this second press station is also described as composed of a pair of rolls. See the first line on page 9. In the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that this two roll pair compacting station can be considered to be a press station. Again, Applicants do not understand why the two roll combinations at page 8, lines 10-18, cannot be considered press stations.

In any event, what happens between the first press station and the second press station (compacting station) is discussed at page 8, lines 21-28. The paper is passed over heated rolls or through a drying tunnel, i.e., it is dried. See, page 8, lines 21-22. And, "[d]uring [this] transfer," i.e., at the same time or "simultaneously," the paper is stretched in the machine direction. See page 8, lines 25-27. Thus, the specification does, in fact, teach drying the paper at the same time it is stretched in the machine direction, i.e., simultaneously.

Respectfully, the claims can be read in a manner consistent with the instant specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are enabled.

Claims 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Dunlap, US 3,055,496. In response, Applicants have canceled claims 25-28 without prejudice.

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a bona fide response to all outstanding objections and rejections.

Applicants also believe that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. However, should any issue(s) of a minor nature remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at telephone number (212) 808-0700 so that the issue(s) might be promptly resolved.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By 

Kurt G. Briscoe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,141
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844